DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 741 HE 003 816

AUTHOR Counelis, James Steve
TITLE Theory and Suggested Framework for Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal in the University.
INSTITUTION San Francisco Univ., Calif. Office of Institutional Studies.
PUB DATE 2 Jan 73
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Techniques; *Formative Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research

ABSTRACT

This document presents a model and description of a systematic institutional performance appraisal instrument. Particular emphasis of the instrument is focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the structure that supports the university's operation toward goal achievement. The instrument is intended to be elementary because it is believed that no sophisticated performance evaluation system installed without systematic internal self-evaluative experience would work. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073741

HE 003 816

University of San Francisco
Office of Institutional Studies

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

San Francisco, California 94117

THEORY AND SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK FOR SELF-EVALUATIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE UNIVERSITY

by

James Steve Counelis

ED 073741

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of Institutional Studies

THEORY AND SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK FOR SELF-EVALUATIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE UNIVERSITY

by

James Steve Counelis

San Francisco, California

January 2, 1973

PREFACE

The subject of this report was suggested by the Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J., President of the University of San Francisco. It was his idea and hope that systematic performance appraisal could be approached with advantage from the viewpoint of the self-evaluation of the university's strengths and weaknesses, particularly emphasis at the beginning on the structure that supports the university's operation toward goal achievement.

This report attempts to present for the institutional level of the university an holistic systematic approach which theoretically is sound. The suggested format for a Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal Report is intended to be elementary, indeed "primitive," in that no sophisticated performance evaluation system installed de novo in an institution without systematic internal self-evaluative experience would work. That is the present stage of organizational development in the University of San Francisco; and I suspect the same is true in even the most prestigious institutions of higher learning in the United States. Further, the Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal Report does not comprehend personnel evaluation because personnel appraisal procedures are of a different order than that of institutional units. Hence another study in that area is warranted.

There is nothing new or revolutionary in the ideas suggested here. What will be revolutionary is their direct empirical application, if that comes to pass. The empirical institutional fact that is the hope of the approach suggested here is the self-informing function which would have a beneficial cybernetic effect upon university operations and achievement. To that end, one must be an incurable optimist. But moreso, one must also be an incurable realist, knowing that the survival of American private higher education, and the University of San Francisco in particular, is dependent upon sensitive reality-testing mechanisms. The Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal Report is designed to be one such reality-testing mechanism.

Again, I am pleased to note the aid of my staff. Mr. William J. Dillon Associate Director, was most helpful in his critical comments. And Miss Diane Pederson completed with excellence the typing, proof-reading and drafting required by this report. I am indebted to them.

Of course, the final responsibility of this report rests with me, as it should. Whatever its merits and defects, I hope that there is some utility found herein.

JSC

January 2, 1973
The University of San Francisco
San Francisco, California 94117

THEORY AND SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK FOR SELF-EVALUATIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE UNIVERSITY

by

James Steve Counelis[+]

Framework:

As conceived here, the framework for self-evaluative performance appraisal in the university consists of three fundamental elements. These are: (1) program goals (P); (2) budgeted goals (B); and (3) operational results (O).

Definitionally the term "program goals" (P) refers to the normatively intended achievements for the university. The term "budgeted goals" (B) denotes those normatively intended achievements invested with resource allocations. With the term "operational results" (O), reference is made to the actual results, holistically obtained through the applied resource investment per normatively intended achievement. In the university context, the following relationship obtains:

$$E = f\ P, B, O. \qquad [1]$$

Symbolic Proposition No. 1 reads: Self-evaluative performance appraisal

---

[+]Dr. James Steve Counelis is Director of the Office of Institutional Studies and Associate Professor of Education in the School of Education in the University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94117.

(E) is a function (f) of program goals (P), budgeted goals (B), and operational results (O). However the nature of this functional relationship needs further definitional clarity.

Evaluation Defined:

The criterion problem is the crux of all evaluation. Within this framework, the criterion is found in the specifically stated program goals (P), viz., the specifically stated normatively intended achievements of the university. The guidance function of program goals (P) is always acknowledged; but program goals (P) are not used systematically in an empirical manner. The suggestion is made here that the university's program goals (P) be taken seriously in an empriical sense. Surely if they are intended, they must be observable. If they are observable to someone on campus, they should be observable to all.

Admitting that the university's program goals (P) are general in character does not vitiate their observable quality. And when one program goal (P) is allocated resources, the budgeted goal (B) ought to become more clearly perceived in empirical terms. It is when the budgeted goals (B) and the actual results, here called generically by the term "operational results" (O), are compared and contrasted that evaluation obtains.

Put at a more generic level, it is the function of program goals (P) to provide specific guidance to the university's resource allocation patterns. It is the function of budgeted goals (B) to delineate in empirical and programatic terms the goals marked for achievement. And it is the

function of operational results (O) to embody the achievement stated in the budgeted goals (B) which in turn reflects the overall university program goals and mission (P). The key terms in evaluation are those of comparison (similarity) and contrast (difference) between criterion (P and B) and results (O). Symbolically, self-evaluative performance appraisal in the university (E) is defined:

$$E = f\, P_n\, [(B_n \sim O_n) \,.\, (B_n - O_n)]. \qquad [2]$$

Symbolic Proposition No. 2 reads: Self-evaluative performance appraisal (E) is defined as a function of the similarities ($B \sim O$) and differences ($B - O$) between budgeted goals (B) and operational results (O) under direct guidance of the university's program goals (P).

Tests of Institutional Achievement:

The pragmatic test of institutional achievement of the university is in the degree of isomorphy among the elements of evaluation, viz., program goals (P), budgeted goals (B), and operational results (O). A low degree of isomorphy among P, B, and O indicates a low level of achievement, a "red flag" for self-examination and feedback for corrective action. A high degree of isomorphy indicates substantive achievement of intended goals. Symbolic representation of the test of isomorphy is indicated as follows:

$$A_n = f\, P_n \equiv B_n \equiv O_n. \qquad [3]$$

Symbolic Proposition No. 3 reads: Achievement (A_n) is a function of the

degree of isomorphy or identity among program goals ($\underline{P}_n$), budgeted goals ($\underline{B}_n$), and operational results ($\underline{O}_n$), each goal taken individually rather than severally.

In Symbolic Proposition No. 3 there are three relationships that produce the intended isomorphy among $\underline{P}_n$, $\underline{B}_n$, and $\underline{O}_n$. These are: (1) $P_n \equiv B_n$; (2) $P_n \equiv O_n$; and (3) $B_n \equiv O_n$. These three relationships provide the analytical tools for achievement accountability. The statement $P_n \equiv B_n$ asserts formal and substantive agreement to be found between particular program goals ($\underline{P}_n$) and particular budgeted goals ($\underline{B}_n$). The statement $P_n \equiv O_n$ asserts the formal and substantive agreement to be found between particular program goals ($\underline{P}_n$) and particular operational results ($\underline{O}_n$). The statement $B_n \equiv O_n$ asserts the formal and substantive agreement to be found between particular budgeted goals and particular operational results. In institutional self-evaluation, these three analytic propositions collectively provide the specific pragmatic test analysis framework and hopefully these help to "zero in" on the focal point of disparity between achievement and non-achievement for each reporting unit's specific goals taken individually and severally.

Institutional Structural Dimensions:

There are two structural dimensions to the university. The vertical dimension designates the hierarchical levels of university organization. These levels are: (1) university-as-a-whole level ($\underline{U}$); (2) school/college level ($\underline{C}$); (3) departmental level ($\underline{D}$), i.e., academic and non-academic; (4) personnel level ($\underline{L}$), i.e., the individual professional and

support staff people.

The horizontal dimension of the university designates the general university elements which cut across all the hierarchical levels. These general elements are: (1) faculty (F); (2) curriculum (K); (3) students (S); and (4) milieu (M). Within milieu (M) is comprehended the following: (a) milieu-administration (M_a); (b) milieu-governance (M_g); (c) milieu-plant/environment (M_p); (d) milieu-external relations (M_e). The cross classification of these two dimensions provides a systematic pinpointing of areas in the university structure in which self-evaluative performance appraisal can take place. The attachment of particular program goals (P), budgeted goals (B), and operational results (O) to the university's organization by areas provides a systematic plan or format to "blanket" the university in its entirety. See attached charts.

Suggested Institutional Report Format:

The attached form is provided to suggest guidance to the theoretical framework provided herein for self-evaluative performance appraisal. Knowing that institutions need training in the installation of new procedures, the attached form is deliberately structured to allow each reporting unit to state its own "perception of goals" at the program and budgeted levels (P and B) and to document empirical achievements at the end of the fiscal year. It is hoped that this report and the attached form provide a useful starting place for university self-evaluation to begin in earnest.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Office of Institutional Studies

SELF-EVALUATIVE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT

Directions:

Self-evaluation is the beginning of competence and the source of improvement because of its cybernetic or self-informing character. This notion of self-evaluation is delineated pragmatically in the report document described below. In it are placed both the criterion and the results of self-examination. Knowing that simplicity and empirical directness are most efficient as principles, the following format for a self-evaluation of performance is presented so that each university reporting unit presents a single pattern. This evaluation report can be done either as a group enterprise or by the university unit's reporting officer.

The Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal Report requires the following five parts. Each part is defined.

(1) Program Goals (P): For this report, the term "program goals" refers to the normatively intended achievements of the reporting unit for the current fiscal year. Hence, the university unit's report should list its normatively intended achievements for the current fiscal year.

(2) Budgeted Goals (B): For this report, the term "budgeted goals" refers to those normatively intended achievements invested with resource allocations for the given university unit's fiscal year. Hence, the university unit's report should list those goals for which resources had been budgeted for the fiscal year.

(3) Operational Results (O): For this report, the term "operational results" refers to the empirical achievements that were produced through the application or investment of resources for given goals, viz., P and B. Hence the reporting unit's report ought to reflect empirically the results obtained for the fiscal year through the application of resources to the stated goals.

(4) Evaluation (E): For this report, the term "evaluation" refers to the degree of success and/or failure in goal achievement, using the criteria of goals given by each reporting unit in the first two parts of the report. Hence the reporting unit's report ought to reflect the documented reasoning for the outcomes obtained during that fiscal year.

(5) Implications for Action: For this report, the term "implications for action" refers to the meaning and import that the evaluation has for valuable university service in the next fiscal year. Hence the report should reflect such recommendations and their reasoning as would effect the improvement of university service to our client students, the community-at-large, and the university community of scholars.

It will be noted that the reporting units will be recording their perceived goals under P and B. And this is as it should be when the institution is launching a Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal program in the university. As time goes on, these goals will shift with the needs and vitality of the institution, calling for full study of university directions every four or five years.

Each Self-Evaluative Performance Appraisal Report is to note specifically the reporting unit, its chief officer, the reporting officer, and whether the self-evaluation was a group or an individual enterprise. If it was a group enterprise, the names of the group appropriately must be included. The report is also to be dated and submitted with a brief letter of transmittal to:

The Office of the President
University Center 425
Campus

The length of the report will follow the needs and dictates of the reporting unit. Supporting empirical evidence can be put in an appendix to the report. Such empirical evidence is encouraged.

APPENDIX

TECHNICAL NOTES

Note No. 1: There are three charts presented in this report. All of them are two dimensional charts involving the three dimensions of university organization and evaluation patterns. However a three dimensional model is possible as well; but it would not be satisfactorily drawn. That would involve taking Chart No. 1 which presents a cross-classification of the horizontal and vertical dimensions of university organization and attaching orthogonally the dimension of evaluation. Hence a cube with 147 cells is possible.

Note No. 2: The text does not provide for a summarizing symbolic proposition for self-evaluative performance appraisal ($\underline{E}$) for the university as a whole. This is achieved by the following proposition:

$$E_u = f\ \Pi\ (\Sigma A_{1n} \cap \Sigma A_{2n} \cap \ldots \Sigma A_{mn}). \qquad [4]$$

Symbolic Proposition No. 4 reads: For the total university, self-evaluative performance appraisal ($\underline{E}_u$) is a function of the product ($\underline{\Pi}$) of the "sums" of the achievements for each evaluated unit ($\underline{\Sigma A}_{mn}$).

CHART NO. 1: HOLISTIC UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

DIMENSION #2: VERTICAL	DIMENSION #1: HORIZONTAL						
	FACULTY (F)	CURRICULUM (K)	STUDENTS (S)	MILIEU (M)			
				ADMINI-STRATION (M_a)	GOVERNANCE (M_g)	PLANT/ ENVIRONMENT (M_p)	EXTERNAL RELATIONS (M_e)
UNIVERSITY (U)							
SCHOOL/ COLLEGE (C)							
DEPARTMENT: ACADEMIC + NON-ACADEMIC (D)							

CHART NO. 2: EVALUATION FORMAT IN TERMS OF HORIZONTAL UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

DIMENSION #3: EVALUATION		DIMENSION #1: HORIZONTAL						
		FACULTY (F)	CURRICULUM (K)	STUDENTS (S)	MILIEU (M)			
					ADMINISTRATION (M_a)	GOVERNANCE (M_g)	PLANT/ENVIRONMENT (M_p)	EXTERNAL RELATIONS (M_e)
PROGRAM GOALS (P)								
BUDGETED GOALS (B)								
OPERATIONS (O)								
EVALUATION/ ACHIEVEMENT	P ≡ B							
	P ≡ O							
	B ≡ O							
	P ≡ B ≡ O							

CHART NO. 3: EVALUATION FORMAT IN TERMS OF VERTICAL UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE

DIMENSION #3: EVALUATION		DIMENSION NO. 2: VERTICAL		
		UNIVERSITY (U)	SCHOOL/COLLEGE (C)	DEPARTMENT: ACADEMIC + NON-ACADEMIC (D)
PROGRAM GOALS (P)				
BUDGETED GOALS (B)				
OPERATIONS (O)				
EVALUATION/ ACHIEVEMENT	P ≡ B			
	P ≡ O			
	B ≡ O			
	P ≡ B ≡ O			

University of San Francisco

Office of Institutional Studies 1/73